

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

July 1, 1998
Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Mesquite Room
302 North First Avenue,
Phoenix, Arizona

VOTING MEMBERS

Carl Doak, Chandler
Mark Weiner, Gilbert
*Pat Thurman, Glendale
*Joe Evans, Goodyear
Bob Erdman, MCDOT
Doug Davis, Mesa

Lisa Ruane, Peoria
Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
*Roger Olsen, Phoenix (Water)
Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
*Andy Goh, Tempe

ADVISORY MEMBERS

*David Tantalean, AGC
Jim Grose, AGC
Paul Nebeker, UTCA

*Jeff Benedict, ARPA
Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering
*Mike Bonar, ACEA

GUESTS/VISITORS

Tom Domizi, UTCA

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of June 3, 1998 were approved as written.

3. Discussion on Submitted Cases

- a. **Case 98-01** - Section 103.6.2 - Indemnification: Pat Thurman was not present and the discussion on the case was limited. As a follow-up to a question from last month's meeting, Doug Davis polled the members regarding the amount of property damage insurance each city was self covered. The members did not have a response. Each member was again requested to provide the information at

the next meeting. If most members have a one million dollar coverage like Mesa, the amount in the case should be adjusted to one million dollars.

- b. **Case 98-02** - Misc. Errors and Omissions: A short discussion was held on each of the cases. Cases A & B were corrected in the last printing of the Specifications and Details (S&Ds). Case C will stand as submitted. Case D will need to be revised to the current test pressures. Case E will be void if Case 98-09 is approved.
- c. **Case 98-03** - Section 738 - HDPE: Rod provided a letter addressed to him by Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc. regarding the case (See Attachment). ADS was concerned about the dual design standards in the specifications between plastic pipe and concrete pipe. Mesa has considered the problem and is considering providing a case next year to standardize the design criteria. Also, Doug presented several problems in the case as it is presently written, e.g., the specification covers perforated and slotted pipe, there is no average inside diameter in the reference material to measure the pipe deflection, etc. The entire specification needs to be reviewed by the sponsor to ensure that no inconsistencies per MAG exist in the proposed case.
- d. **Case 98-05** - Section 321 - Asphalt Concrete Pavement: A short discussion was held on this case. Doug pointed out the major changes in the case, e.g., types of rollers, screws and vibrators when extending the screeds, etc. A motion was presented and seconded by the committee for a vote. The case (version dated June 15, 1998) was unanimously approved.
- e. **Case 98-06** - Section 340 - Concrete Sidewalk Ramps: There was a short discussion as to the method of payment for the installation of the ramps. Carol Doak noted that this case does not apply to installation of ramps in existing returns. Doug concurred, this case is for new construction similar to the other items covered in the subsection. A motion was presented and seconded by the committee for a vote. The case (version date May 18, 1998) was unanimously approved.
- f. **Case 98-09** - Detail 533 and 536 - Type 'D' Catch Basin: The case was reviewed and discussed by the committee. Several changes and corrections were suggested. The case will be revised and resubmitted for further review and comments. Changes/corrections were as follows: 533-1: widen the gutter in front of the basin, need section arrows C-C, clarify dimension H to ensure it is the adjacent curb, 533-3: arrow head to leader line, move section F-F to other side, show grate without the radius, 536-1: change the radius on the protection bar detail.
- g. **Case 98-10** - Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete: Doug provided a revised page 5 of 9. All of the earlier comments were on this one page. Bob Erdman noted that the work "minimum" was omitted in the minimum dry tensile strength. There was discussion as to the value to set the minimum TSR test. The value established in the case was based on test data provided by the City of Mesa Material Laboratory and Don Green of United Metro. Doug noted that the minimum value should not be the critical design criteria. The ratio should be the critical/controlling factor. The minimum value is only a safety net.
- h. **Case 98-11** - Detail 420 - Pre-Case Concrete Sewer Manhole: Doug provided a short explanation as to the reason for the case (see cover memo). There is no reference in the specifications and details to require a collar around the manhole frame.

- i. **Case 98-12** - Detail - Brick Sewer Manhole & Frame Adjustment: Doug provided a short explanation as to the reason for the case (See cover memo). The case corrects the type of asphalt mix to be installed over the portland cement concrete collar. Also, the title was changed to better describe the detail.
- j. **Case 98-13** - Section 336 - Pavement Matching & Surface Replacement: Peter Kandarlis provided a short explanation as to the reason for the case (See cover memo). The case allows for a negotiated amount of money to be established between the contractor and the agency for the cost of sealing the streets. The existing fixed price may not be representative of today's costs. The committee provided a couple of comments regarding the wording. Jeff Van Skike would like to review the 600 foot distance in the prior paragraph. He will submit something to Doug in a couple of weeks so it may be included within next month's packet.
- k. **Case 98-14** - Detail 120 - Survey Marker: Doug provided a short explanation as to the reason for the case (See cover memo). For the agencies that require the chain, the contractor is inadvertently omitting the chain. By showing the chain in the drawing and calling out the note, it may bring attention to the contractor the requirement for the chain. In Detail 120-2, the chain was left off the drawing. Paul Ward noted and Bob Erdman confirmed that the brass cap did not have the correct county name. It should read "MARICOPA COUNTY D.O.T."

4. Submittal, Review, and Discussion of New Cases:

- a. Rod Ramos submitted a number of corrections/bloopers discovered in the specifications.

5. General Discussion:

- a. Rod received a letter from the Arizona Chapter of Associated General Contractors stating that Jimmy Pulice will replace David Tantalean as their representative. Jimmy should begin attending at the next meeting.
- b. Paul Ward Discussed the following items:
 - 1) Paul and MAG staff are looking into the copyright of the S&Ds. There was a short discussion regarding the topic. Doug noted that the committee looked into the case and decided to drop it. Doug will send Paul a copy of a draft case discussed by the committee.
 - 2) Paul mentioned that MAG staff is now working on the metric version of the S Ds. They intend to have the revisions ready for sale by January 1999. It will include all revisions through 1998.
 - 3) MAG staff has received requests to purchase each agency's S&Ds and/or their additions and deletions. They reviewed the idea of selling each of the agency's S&Ds however, it is not approved. For persons that request the information, Paul will assemble a hand out list of agencies that have their own S&Ds and/or additions and deletions, contact person, cost, address to write to, etc.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.